

## **REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow. Applicants respectfully request that the foregoing amendments be entered, at least because they do not raise any new issues requiring further search or consideration.

Claims 19, 21, 22, 28 and 29 are requested to be cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 18 and 29 are currently being amended. Claim 18 has been amended to include the features of claims 19, 21 and 22, now cancelled. Claim 25 has been amended to depend from claim 18, and claim 29 to correct an informality.

This amendment changes and deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 18, 20, 23-27 and 29 are now pending in this application.

### ***Claim objections***

Claims 22 and 29 were objected to for informalities. Claims 22 and 29 have been canceled. Claim 18, which has been amended to include the features of claim 22, has also been amended to correct the informality noted in the Office Action.

### ***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 18-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,299,198 to Nakashima et al. ("Nakashima") in view of U.S. Patent 5,961,142 to Shiraki et al. ("Shiraki"). Claims 25-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakashima in view of Shiraki and in view of U.S. Patent 6,402,189 to Gray et al. ("Gray"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 18, as amended, recites “wherein the longitudinal beads are all parallel with an equal space therebetween” and “a plurality of bosses provided on the back of the airbag lid and near the hinge portion and a plurality of installation holes formed inside the lattice form in the door body, and wherein the bosses are inserted into, and are fixed with, the holes, by which the door body is mounted to the back of the airbag lid.” The references applied in the rejection of the claims fail to disclose at least these features of the claims.

Neither Nakashima nor Shiraki discloses the feature of claim 18 of “wherein the longitudinal beads are all parallel with an equal space therebetween.” Neither the vertically extending recesses 5d of Nakashima, nor the linear protrusions 50a of Shiraki are arranged so that they are all parallel with an equal space therebetween. In particular, as shown in Fig. 4 of Shiraki, the spacing between the second and third linear protrusion 50a from the left do not have the same spacing therebetween as between other of the linear protrusions. Thus, even if Nakashima and Shiraki were combined, the result would not have all the features of claim 18.

Nakashima and Shiraki also fail to disclose the feature of claim 18 of “a plurality of bosses provided on the back of the airbag lid and near the hinge portion and a plurality of installation holes formed inside the lattice form in the door body, and wherein the bosses are inserted into, and are fixed with, the holes, by which the door body is mounted to the back of the airbag lid.” The Office Action relies on Nakashima for disclosing bosses on the back of an airbag lid and corresponding installation holes on a door body, and relies on Shiraki for disclosing parallel and longitudinal beads constructing a lattice form. Even if Nakashima were modified to include parallel and longitudinal beads for constructing a lattice form (for which there is no motivation from Shiraki to do so), however, there is no discussion from either Shiraki or Nakashima that any installation holes in Nakashima should be formed inside the lattice form. Thus, even if Nakashima and Shiraki were combined, the combination would not include the feature of claim 18 of “a plurality of bosses provided on the back of the airbag lid and near the hinge portion and a plurality of installation holes formed inside the lattice form in the door body, and wherein the bosses are inserted into, and are fixed with, the holes, by which the door body is mounted to the back of the airbag lid.”

Gray was cited for other features of the claims, but fails to cure the deficiencies of Nakashima and Shiraki.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorize payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date August 24, 2007

By Thomas G. Bilodeau

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22428  
Telephone: (202) 945-6162  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Pavan K. Agarwal  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 40,888

Thomas G. Bilodeau  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 43,438